



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,324	04/21/2004	Sang-Ho Shin	252079US2	4226

22850 7590 11/22/2005

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

MILLER, BRANDON J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2683

DATE MAILED: 11/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/828,324		SHIN ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Brandon J. Miller		2683	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 4/21/2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 5-6, 12, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jambhekar.

Regarding claim 1 Jambhekar teaches an electronic directory of phone numbers (see col. 5, lines 28-30). Jambhekar teaches a plurality of graphic icons; and a plurality of phone numbers respectively linked to the plurality of graphic icons (see col. 5, lines 54-59 and col. 6, lines 29-35).

Regarding claim 5 Jambhekar teaches a mobile terminal, comprising an electronic directory of phone numbers (see col. 5, lines 28-30). Jambhekar teaches a plurality of graphic icons, and a plurality of phone numbers respectively linked to the plurality of graphic icons (see col. 5, lines 54-59 and col. 6, lines 29-35). Jambhekar teaches controlling and managing the electronic directory (see col. 3, lines 19-26).

Regarding claim 6 Jambhekar teaches a registration processor for registering a desired phone number (see col. 3, lines 29-35 and col. 5, lines 49-54 & 60-63). Jambhekar teaches searching for a desired phone number (see col. 6, lines 58-64).

Regarding claim 12 Jambhekar teaches a memory having a plurality of icons (see col. 7, lines 27-30 and col. 9, lines 20-22).

Art Unit: 2683

Regarding claim 15 Jambhekar teaches an electronic directory of phone numbers (see col. 5, lines 28-30). Jambhekar teaches a plurality of symbols; and a plurality of phone numbers respectively linked to the plurality of symbols (see col. 5, lines 54-59 and col. 6, lines 29-35).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-4, 7-11, 13-14, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jambhekar in view of Smith.

Regarding claim 2 Jambhekar teaches a device as recited in claim 1 except for the plurality of graphic icons form a graphic map. Smith teaches a graphic icon in the form a graphic map (see col. 7, lines 64-67 and col. 8, lines 1-3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include the plurality of graphic icons form a graphic map because it would allow for an improved system for presenting information in a communication device.

Regarding claim 3 Jambhekar and Smith teach a device as recited in claim 2 except for a community configured by the icons. Smith does teach a community configured by the icons (see col. 7, lines 41-49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include a community configured by the icons because it would allow for an improved system for presenting information in a communication device.

Regarding claim 4 Jambhekar teaches a device as recited in claim 1 except for each of the icons is updated according to a call history based on a phone number mapped thereto. Smith teaches each of the icons is updated according to a call history based on a phone number mapped thereto (see col. 6, lines 65-67 and col. 8, lines 32-34 & 50-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include each of the icons is updated according to a call history based on a phone number mapped thereto because it would allow for an improved system for presenting information in a communication device.

Regarding claim 7 Jambhekar teaches a device as recited in claim 5 except for an update manager for varying a shape or a color of the graphic icon. Smith teaches an update manager for varying a shape or a color of a graphic icon (see col. 8, lines 1-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the device adapt to include an update manager for varying a shape or a color of the graphic icon because it would allow for an improved system for presenting information in a communication device.

Regarding claim 8 Jambhekar teaches a device as recited in claim 5 except for a download processor for downloading the graphic icon from a service provider. Jambhekar does teach receiving and sending messages over a network (see col. 7, lines 23-30). Smith teaches downloading a graphic icon from a service provider (see col. 6, lines 66-67, col. 7, lines 1-3 and col. 11, lines 24-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the device was made to make the sending messages in Jambhekar adapt to include a download processor for downloading the graphic icon from a service provider because the graphical icon

Art Unit: 2683

can be sent as a message from a service provider and it would allow for an improved system for presenting information in a communication device.

Regarding claim 9 Jambhekar and Smith teach a device as recited in claim 2 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Regarding claim 10 Jambhekar and Smith teach a device as recited in claim 3 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Regarding claim 11 Jambhekar and Smith teach a device as recited in claim 4 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Regarding claim 13 Jambhekar teaches a method for managing an electronic directory of phone numbers in a mobile terminal comprising a graphic icon (see col. 5, lines 28-30).

Jambhekar teaches linking the graphic icon with a phone number (see col. 5, lines 54-59 and col. 6, lines 29-35). Jambhekar does not specifically teach downloading a graphic icon from a service provider. Jambhekar does teach receiving and sending messages over a network (see col. 7, lines 23-30). Smith teaches downloading a graphic icon from a service provider (see col. 6, lines 66-67, col. 7, lines 1-3 and col. 11, lines 24-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the device was made to make the sending messages in Jambhekar adapt to include downloading a graphic icon from a service provider because the graphical icon can be sent as a message from a service provider and it would allow for an improved system for presenting information in a communication device.

Regarding claim 14 Jambhekar and Smith teach a device as recited in claim 4 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Art Unit: 2683

Regarding claim 16 Jambhekar and Smith teach a device as recited in claim 2 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Regarding claim 17 Jambhekar and Smith teach a device as recited in claim 3 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Regarding claim 18 Jambhekar and Smith teach a device as recited in claim 4 and is rejected given the same reasoning as above.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Moon et al. U.S Patent No. 6,211,858 B1 discloses a method and apparatus for displaying a rotating meter icon on a portable intelligent communications device.

Mugura et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,374,121 B1 discloses a system and method for enabling automatic performance of instrument functions.

Narusawa. U.S. Patent No. 6,823,183 B2 discloses a telephone system having a telephone directory information.

Takahashi. U.S. Patent No. 6,377,794 B2 discloses a communication apparatus notifying calling information to called party.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon J. Miller whose telephone number is 571-272-7869.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

Art Unit: 2683

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on 571-272-7872. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'B. Trost'.

November 14, 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'W. Trost'.

WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600